§ 152. Application of chapter

. . .

(b) Except as provided in sections 223 through 227 of this title, inclusive, and section 332 of this title, and subject to the provisions of section 301 of this title and subchapter V-A of this chapter, nothing in this chapter shall be construed to apply or to give the Commission jurisdiction with respect to (1) charges, classifications, practices, services, facilities, or regulations for or in connection with intrastate communication service by wire or radio of any carrier, or (2) any carrier engaged in interstate or foreign communication solely through physical connection with the facilities of another carrier not directly or indirectly controlling or controlled by, or under direct or indirect common control with such carrier, or (3) any carrier engaged in interstate or foreign communication solely through connection by radio, or by wire and radio, with facilities, located in an adjoining State or in Canada or Mexico (where they adjoin the State in which the carrier is doing business), of another carrier not directly or indirectly controlling or controlled by, or under direct or indirect common control with such carrier, or (4) any carrier to which clause (2) or clause (3) of this subsection would be applicable except for furnishing interstate mobile radio communication service or radio communication service to mobile stations on land vehicles in Canada or Mexico; except that sections 201 to 205 of this title shall, except as otherwise provided therein, apply to carriers described in clauses (2), (3), and (4) of this subsection.

SEC. 251. [47 U.S.C. 251] INTERCONNECTION.

(a) GENERAL DUTY OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIERS.—Each telecommunications carrier has the duty—

(1) to interconnect directly or indirectly with the facilities and equipment of other telecommunications carriers; and

(2) not to install network features, functions, or capabilities that do not comply with the guidelines and standards established pursuant to section 255 or 256.

(b) OBLIGATIONS OF ALL LOCAL EXCHANGE CARRIERS.—Each local exchange carrier has the following duties:

(1) RESALE.—The duty not to prohibit, and not to impose unreasonable or discriminatory conditions or limitations on, the resale of its telecommunications services.

(2) NUMBER PORTABILITY.—The duty to provide, to the extent technically feasible, number portability in accordance with requirements prescribed by the Commission.

(3) DIALING PARITY.—The duty to provide dialing parity to competing providers of telephone exchange service and telephone toll service, and the duty to permit all such providers to have nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers, operator services, directory assistance, and directory listing, with no unreasonable dialing delays.

(4) ACCESS TO RIGHTS-OF-WAY.—The duty to afford access to the poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way of such carrier to competing providers of telecommunications services on rates, terms, and conditions that are consistent with section 224.

(5) RECIPROCAL COMPENSATION.—The duty to establish reciprocal compensation arrangements for the transport and termination of telecommunications.

(c) ADDITIONAL OBLIGATIONS OF INCUMBENT LOCAL EXCHANGE CARRIERS.—In addition to the duties contained in subsection (b), each incumbent local exchange carrier has the following duties:

(1) DUTY TO NEGOTIATE.—The duty to negotiate in good faith in accordance with section 252 the particular terms and conditions of agreements to fulfill the duties described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (b) and this subsection.

The requesting telecommunications carrier also has the duty to negotiate in good faith the terms and conditions of such agreements.

(2) INTERCONNECTION.—The duty to provide, for the facilities and equipment of any requesting telecommunications carrier, interconnection with the local exchange carrier's network—

(A) for the transmission and routing of telephone exchange service and exchange access;

(B) at any technically feasible point within the carrier's network;

(C) that is at least equal in quality to that provided by the local exchange carrier to itself or to any subsidiary, affiliate, or any other party to which the carrier provides interconnection; and

(D) on rates, terms, and conditions that are just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the agreement and the requirements of this section and section 252.

(3) UNBUNDLED ACCESS.—The duty to provide, to any requesting telecommunications carrier for the provision of a telecommunications service, nondiscriminatory access to network elements on an unbundled basis at any technically feasible point on rates, terms, and conditions that are just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory in accordance with the terms and conditions of the agreement and the requirements of this section and section 252. An incumbent local exchange carrier shall provide such unbundled network elements in a manner that allows requesting carriers to combine such elements in order to provide such telecommunications service.

(4) RESALE.—The duty—

(A) to offer for resale at wholesale rates any telecommunications service that the carrier provides at retail to subscribers who are not telecommunications carriers; and

(B) not to prohibit, and not to impose unreasonable or discriminatory conditions or limitations on, the resale of such telecommunications service, except that a State commission may, consistent with regulations prescribed by the Commission under this section, prohibit a reseller that obtains at wholesale rates a telecommunications service that is available at retail only to a category of subscribers from offering such service to a different category of subscribers.

(5) NOTICE OF CHANGES.—The duty to provide reasonable public notice of changes in the information necessary for the transmission and routing of services using that local exchange carrier's facilities or networks, as well as of any other changes that would affect the interoperability of those facilities and networks.

(6) COLLOCATION.—The duty to provide, on rates, terms, and conditions that are just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory, for physical collocation of equipment necessary for interconnection or access to unbundled network elements at the premises of the local exchange carrier, except that the car-

rier may provide for virtual collocation if the local exchange carrier demonstrates to the State commission that physical collocation is not practical for technical reasons or because of space limitations.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Within 6 months after the date of enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, the Commission shall complete all actions necessary to establish regulations to implement the requirements of this section.

(2) ACCESS STANDARDS.—In determining what network elements should be made available for purposes of subsection (c)(3), the Commission shall consider, at a minimum, whether—

(A) access to such network elements as are proprietary in nature is necessary; and

(B) the failure to provide access to such network elements would impair the ability of the telecommunications carrier seeking access to provide the services that it seeks to offer.

(3) PRESERVATION OF STATE ACCESS REGULATIONS.—In prescribing and enforcing regulations to implement the requirements of this section, the Commission shall not preclude the enforcement of any regulation, order, or policy of a State commission that—

(A) establishes access and interconnection obligations of local exchange carriers;

(B) is consistent with the requirements of this section; and

(C) does not substantially prevent implementation of the requirements of this section and the purposes of this part.

(e) NUMBERING ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) COMMISSION AUTHORITY AND JURISDICTION.—The Commission shall create or designate one or more impartial entities to administer telecommunications numbering and to make such numbers available on an equitable basis. The Commission shall have exclusive jurisdiction over those portions of the North American Numbering Plan that pertain to the United States. Nothing in this paragraph shall preclude the Commission from delegating to State commissions or other entities all or any portion of such jurisdiction.

(2) COSTS.—The cost of establishing telecommunications numbering administration arrangements and number portability shall be borne by all telecommunications carriers on a competitively neutral basis as determined by the Commission.

(f) EXEMPTIONS, SUSPENSIONS, AND MODIFICATIONS.—

(1) EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN RURAL TELEPHONE COMPANIES.—

(A) EXEMPTION.—Subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to a rural telephone company until (i) such company has received a bona fide request for interconnection, services, or network elements, and (ii) the State commission determines (under subparagraph (B)) that such request is not unduly economically burdensome, is technically feasible, and is consistent with section 254 (other than subsections (b)(7) and (c)(1)(D) thereof).

(B) STATE TERMINATION OF EXEMPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE.—The party making a bona fide request of a rural telephone company for interconnection, services, or network elements shall submit a notice of its request to the State commission. The State commission shall conduct an inquiry for the purpose of determining whether to terminate the exemption under subparagraph (A). Within 120 days after the State commission receives notice of the request, the State commission shall terminate the exemption if the request is not unduly economically burdensome, is technically feasible, and is consistent with section 254 (other than subsections (b)(7) and (c)(1)(D) thereof). Upon termination of the exemption, a State commission shall establish an implementation schedule for compliance with the request that is consistent in time and manner with Commission regulations.

(C) LIMITATION ON EXEMPTION.—The exemption provided by this paragraph shall not apply with respect to a request under subsection (c) from a cable operator providing video programming, and seeking to provide any telecommunications service, in the area in which the rural telephone company provides video programming. The limitation contained in this subparagraph shall not apply to a rural telephone company that is providing video programming on the date of enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

(2) SUSPENSIONS AND MODIFICATIONS FOR RURAL CARRIERS.—A local exchange carrier with fewer than 2 percent of the Nation's subscriber lines installed in the aggregate nationwide may petition a State commission for a suspension or modification of the application of a requirement or requirements of subsection (b) or (c) to telephone exchange service facilities specified in such petition. The State commission shall grant such petition to the extent that, and for such duration as, the State commission determines that such suspension or modification—

(A) is necessary—

(i) to avoid a significant adverse economic impact on users of telecommunications services generally;

(ii) to avoid imposing a requirement that is unduly economically burdensome; or

(iii) to avoid imposing a requirement that is technically infeasible; and

(B) is consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

The State commission shall act upon any petition filed under this paragraph within 180 days after receiving such petition. Pending such action, the State commission may suspend enforcement of the requirement or requirements to which the petition applies with respect to the petitioning carrier or carriers.

(g) CONTINUED ENFORCEMENT OF EXCHANGE ACCESS AND INTERCONNECTION REQUIREMENTS.—On and after the date of enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, each local exchange carrier, to the extent that it provides wireline services, shall provide exchange access, information access, and exchange services for such access to interexchange carriers and information service providers in accordance with the same equal access and nondiscriminatory interconnection restrictions and obligations (including receipt of compensation) that apply to such carrier on the date immediately preceding the date of enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 under any court order, consent decree, or regulation, order, or policy of the Commission, until such restrictions and obligations are explicitly superseded by regulations prescribed by the Commission after such date of enactment. During the period beginning on such date of enactment and until such restrictions and obligations are so superseded, such restrictions and obligations shall be enforceable in the same manner as regulations of the Commission.

(h) DEFINITION OF INCUMBENT LOCAL EXCHANGE CARRIER.—

(1) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "incumbent local exchange carrier" means, with respect to an area, the local exchange carrier that—

(A) on the date of enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, provided telephone exchange service in such area; and

(B)(i) on such date of enactment, was deemed to be a member of the exchange carrier association pursuant to section 69.601(b) of the Commission's regulations (47 C.F.R. 69.601(b)); or

(ii) is a person or entity that, on or after such date of enactment, became a successor or assign of a member described in clause (i).

(2) TREATMENT OF COMPARABLE CARRIERS AS INCUMBENTS.—The Commission may, by rule, provide for the treatment of a local exchange carrier (or class or category thereof) as an incumbent local exchange carrier for purposes of this section if—

(A) such carrier occupies a position in the market for telephone exchange service within an area that is comparable to the position occupied by a carrier described in paragraph (1);

(B) such carrier has substantially replaced an incumbent local exchange carrier described in paragraph (1); and

(C) such treatment is consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity and the purposes of this section.

(i) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or otherwise affect the Commission's authority under section 201.

SEC. 252. [47 U.S.C. 252] PROCEDURES FOR NEGOTIATION, ARBITRATION, AND APPROVAL OF AGREEMENTS.

(a) AGREEMENTS ARRIVED AT THROUGH NEGOTIATION.—

(1) VOLUNTARY NEGOTIATIONS.—Upon receiving a request for interconnection, services, or network elements pursuant to section 251, an incumbent local exchange carrier may negotiate and enter into a binding agreement with the requesting tele-

communications carrier or carriers without regard to the standards set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 251. The agreement shall include a detailed schedule of itemized charges for interconnection and each service or network element included in the agreement. The agreement, including any interconnection agreement negotiated before the date of enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, shall be submitted to the State commission under subsection (e) of this section.

(2) MEDIATION.—Any party negotiating an agreement under this section may, at any point in the negotiation, ask a State commission to participate in the negotiation and to mediate any differences arising in the course of the negotiation.

(b) AGREEMENTS ARRIVED AT THROUGH COMPULSORY ARBITRATION.—

(1) ARBITRATION.—During the period from the 135th to the 160th day (inclusive) after the date on which an incumbent local exchange carrier receives a request for negotiation under this section, the carrier or any other party to the negotiation may petition a State commission to arbitrate any open issues.

(2) DUTY OF PETITIONER.—

(A) A party that petitions a State commission under paragraph (1) shall, at the same time as it submits the petition, provide the State commission all relevant documentation concerning—

(i) the unresolved issues;

(ii) the position of each of the parties with respect to those issues; and

(iii) any other issue discussed and resolved by the parties.

(B) A party petitioning a State commission under paragraph (1) shall provide a copy of the petition and any documentation to the other party or parties not later than the day on which the State commission receives the petition.

(3) OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND.—A non-petitioning party to a negotiation under this section may respond to the other party's petition and provide such additional information as it wishes within 25 days after the State commission receives the petition.

(4) ACTION BY STATE COMMISSION.—

(A) The State commission shall limit its consideration of any petition under paragraph (1) (and any response thereto) to the issues set forth in the petition and in the response, if any, filed under paragraph (3).

(B) The State commission may require the petitioning party and the responding party to provide such information as may be necessary for the State commission to reach a decision on the unresolved issues. If any party refuses or fails unreasonably to respond on a timely basis to any reasonable request from the State commission, then the State commission may proceed on the basis of the best information available to it from whatever source derived.

(C) The State commission shall resolve each issue set forth in the petition and the response, if any, by imposing appropriate conditions as required to implement subsection (c) upon the parties to the agreement, and shall conclude the resolution of any unresolved issues not later than 9 months after the date on which the local exchange carrier received the request under this section.

(5) REFUSAL TO NEGOTIATE.—The refusal of any other party to the negotiation to participate further in the negotiations, to cooperate with the State commission in carrying out its function as an arbitrator, or to continue to negotiate in good faith in the presence, or with the assistance, of the State commission shall be considered a failure to negotiate in good faith.

(c) STANDARDS FOR ARBITRATION.—In resolving by arbitration under subsection (b) any open issues and imposing conditions upon the parties to the agreement, a State commission shall—

(1) ensure that such resolution and conditions meet the requirements of section 251, including the regulations prescribed by the Commission pursuant to section 251;

(2) establish any rates for interconnection, services, or network elements according to subsection (d); and

(3) provide a schedule for implementation of the terms and conditions by the parties to the agreement.

(d) PRICING STANDARDS.—

(1) INTERCONNECTION AND NETWORK ELEMENT CHARGES.—Determinations by a State commission of the just and reasonable rate for the interconnection of facilities and equipment for purposes of subsection (c)(2) of section 251, and the just and reasonable rate for network elements for purposes of subsection (c)(3) of such section—

(A) shall be—

(i) based on the cost (determined without reference to a rate-of-return or other rate-based proceeding) of providing the interconnection or network element (whichever is applicable), and

(ii) nondiscriminatory, and

(B) may include a reasonable profit.

(2) CHARGES FOR TRANSPORT AND TERMINATION OF TRAFFIC.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of compliance by an incumbent local exchange carrier with section 251(b)(5), a State commission shall not consider the terms and conditions for reciprocal compensation to be just and reasonable unless—

(i) such terms and conditions provide for the mutual and reciprocal recovery by each carrier of costs associated with the transport and termination on each carrier's network facilities of calls that originate on the network facilities of the other carrier; and

(ii) such terms and conditions determine such costs on the basis of a reasonable approximation of the additional costs of terminating such calls.

(B) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—This paragraph shall not be construed—

(i) to preclude arrangements that afford the mutual recovery of costs through the offsetting of reciprocal obligations, including arrangements that waive mutual recovery (such as bill-and-keep arrangements); or

(ii) to authorize the Commission or any State commission to engage in any rate regulation proceeding to establish with particularity the additional costs of transporting or terminating calls, or to require carriers to maintain records with respect to the additional costs of such calls.

(3) WHOLESALE PRICES FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES.—For the purposes of section 251(c)(4), a State commission shall determine wholesale rates on the basis of retail rates charged to subscribers for the telecommunications service requested, excluding the portion thereof attributable to any marketing, billing, collection, and other costs that will be avoided by the local exchange carrier.

(e) APPROVAL BY STATE COMMISSION.—

(1) APPROVAL REQUIRED.—Any interconnection agreement adopted by negotiation or arbitration shall be submitted for approval to the State commission. A State commission to which an agreement is submitted shall approve or reject the agreement, with written findings as to any deficiencies.

(2) GROUNDS FOR REJECTION.—The State commission may only reject—

(A) an agreement (or any portion thereof) adopted by negotiation under subsection (a) if it finds that—

(i) the agreement (or portion thereof) discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement; or

(ii) the implementation of such agreement or portion is not consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity; or

(B) an agreement (or any portion thereof) adopted by arbitration under subsection (b) if it finds that the agreement does not meet the requirements of section 251, including the regulations prescribed by the Commission pursuant to section 251, or the standards set forth in subsection (d) of this section.

(3) PRESERVATION OF AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), but subject to section 253, nothing in this section shall prohibit a State commission from establishing or enforcing other requirements of State law in its review of an agreement, including requiring compliance with intrastate telecommunications service quality standards or requirements.

(4) SCHEDULE FOR DECISION.—If the State commission does not act to approve or reject the agreement within 90 days after submission by the parties of an agreement adopted by negotiation under subsection (a), or within 30 days after submission by the parties of an agreement adopted by arbitration under subsection (b), the agreement shall be deemed approved. No State court shall have jurisdiction to review the action of a

State commission in approving or rejecting an agreement under this section.

(5) COMMISSION TO ACT IF STATE WILL NOT ACT.—If a State commission fails to act to carry out its responsibility under this section in any proceeding or other matter under this section, then the Commission shall issue an order preempting the State commission's jurisdiction of that proceeding or matter within 90 days after being notified (or taking notice) of such failure, and shall assume the responsibility of the State commission under this section with respect to the proceeding or matter and act for the State commission.

(6) REVIEW OF STATE COMMISSION ACTIONS.—In a case in which a State fails to act as described in paragraph (5), the proceeding by the Commission under such paragraph and any judicial review of the Commission's actions shall be the exclusive remedies for a State commission's failure to act. In any case in which a State commission makes a determination under this section, any party aggrieved by such determination may bring an action in an appropriate Federal district court to determine whether the agreement or statement meets the requirements of section 251 and this section.

(f) STATEMENTS OF GENERALLY AVAILABLE TERMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A Bell operating company may prepare and file with a State commission a statement of the terms and conditions that such company generally offers within that State to comply with the requirements of section 251 and the regulations thereunder and the standards applicable under this section.

(2) STATE COMMISSION REVIEW.—A State commission may not approve such statement unless such statement complies with subsection (d) of this section and section 251 and the regulations thereunder. Except as provided in section 253, nothing in this section shall prohibit a State commission from establishing or enforcing other requirements of State law in its review of such statement, including requiring compliance with intrastate telecommunications service quality standards or requirements.

(3) SCHEDULE FOR REVIEW.—The State commission to which a statement is submitted shall, not later than 60 days after the date of such submission—

(A) complete the review of such statement under paragraph (2) (including any reconsideration thereof), unless the submitting carrier agrees to an extension of the period for such review; or

(B) permit such statement to take effect.

(4) AUTHORITY TO CONTINUE REVIEW.—Paragraph (3) shall not preclude the State commission from continuing to review a statement that has been permitted to take effect under subparagraph (B) of such paragraph or from approving or disapproving such statement under paragraph (2).

(5) DUTY TO NEGOTIATE NOT AFFECTED.—The submission or approval of a statement under this subsection shall not relieve a Bell operating company of its duty to negotiate the terms and conditions of an agreement under section 251.

(g) CONSOLIDATION OF STATE PROCEEDINGS.—Where not inconsistent with the requirements of this Act, a State commission may, to the extent practical, consolidate proceedings under sections 214(e), 251(f), 253, and this section in order to reduce administrative burdens on telecommunications carriers, other parties to the proceedings, and the State commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act.

(h) FILING REQUIRED.—A State commission shall make a copy of each agreement approved under subsection (e) and each statement approved under subsection (f) available for public inspection and copying within 10 days after the agreement or statement is approved. The State commission may charge a reasonable and nondiscriminatory fee to the parties to the agreement or to the party filing the statement to cover the costs of approving and filing such agreement or statement.

(i) AVAILABILITY TO OTHER TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIERS.—A local exchange carrier shall make available any interconnection, service, or network element provided under an agreement approved under this section to which it is a party to any other requesting telecommunications carrier upon the same terms and conditions as those provided in the agreement.

(j) DEFINITION OF INCUMBENT LOCAL EXCHANGE CARRIER.—For purposes of this section, the term "incumbent local exchange carrier" has the meaning provided in section 251(h).

TAB B

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

GTE Service Corporation, GTE Alaska Incorporated, GTE Arkansas Incorporated, GTE California Incorporated, GTE Florida Incorporated, GTE Midwest Incorporated, GTE South Incorporated, GTE Southwest Incorporated, GTE North Incorporated, GTE Northwest Incorporated, GTE Hawaiian Telephone Company Incorporated, GTE West Coast Incorporated, Contel of California, Inc., Contel of Minnesota, Inc. and Contel of the South, Inc. Petitioners, v. Federal Communications Commission and United States of America, Respondents.	)	Case No. _________ (DC Circuit Case No. 96-1319) (Consolidated with Case No. 96-3321)

SUPPLEMENTAL AFFIDAVIT OF DENNIS B. TRIMBLE

STATE OF TEXAS §
§
COUNTY OF DALLAS §

Dennis B. Trimble, being duly sworn according to law, states as follows:

1. My name is Dennis B. Trimble and I am the Assistant Vice President - Marketing Service (Acting) for GTE Telephone Operations ("GTE" or "the Company"). In that capacity I

am responsible for, among other matters, analyzing the demand characteristics of GTE's regulated product offerings and developing costs, prices and associated tariff filings for all of GTE's regulated services, inclusive of tariff filing activity with the FCC.

2. I have over 20 years experience with GTE. During this time I have held various positions throughout the Company, almost all related to demand analysis, market research, forecasting, and/or the pricing of regulated telecommunication services. I have a B.A. in Business (1970) and an M.B.A. (1973) both from Washington State University. In 1972, I became an Assistant Professor at the University of Idaho, where I taught courses in statistics, operations research and decision theory. From 1973 through 1976, I completed course work toward a Ph.D. degree in Business at the University of Washington, majoring in quantitative methods with minors in computer science, research methods, and economics.

3. I have reviewed in detail the Federal Communications Commission's ("FCC") *First Report and Order* in CC Docket No. 96-98 which was issued on August 8, 1996. Among other things, the *First Report and Order* establishes (at ¶¶ 789-827) default proxy ceiling prices that are to be used after an arbitration proceeding as the price for unbundled network elements unless a state regulatory agency has completed its review of studies that comport to the FCC's prescribed, new costing methodology.

4. I previously provided an affidavit (*Original Trimble Affidavit*) that was attached to the Joint Motion of GTE Corporation and the Southern New England Telephone Company for Stay Pending Judicial Review filed with the FCC ("*GTE/SNET FCC Motion*"). The *Original Trimble Affidavit* had two main purposes: (i) to describe the GTE cost studies submitted in a

Florida Public Service Commission ("FPSC") proceeding that were used by the FCC in developing a proxy for the outcome of a study conducted according to its new cost methodology; and (ii) to compare the forward-looking cost studies typically prepared by GTE with the new, forward-looking costing methodology required by the *First Report and Order.* To recap that discussion, GTE's forward-looking cost studies use a Total Service Long Run Incremental Cost ("TSLRIC") methodology. The *First Report and Order* requires use (at ¶¶ 672-703) of a methodology the FCC calls Total Element Long Run Incremental Cost ("TELRIC"). The primary difference lies in the allocation of common costs that cannot be directly assigned to a particular service or network element. GTE's methodology would assign all common costs to various services during the pricing process, using a method based on the market-allowed contribution levels. The FCC's methodology assigns as much of the common costs as possible to each network element if there is any possible reasonable relationship that can be used for assignment. For the remaining costs for which a reasonable relationship simply does not exist (*e.g.*, the company president's salary), the *First Report and Order* describes (at ¶¶ 694-699) a pricing development procedure using "reasonable" allocation methodologies (*e.g.*, uniform percent markup).

5. The *Original Trimble Affidavit* demonstrated that the FCC's reliance upon the GTE Florida study output as a reasonable approximation of the cost estimates that would be produced by a study conducted using the new FCC methodology was flawed. It further showed that the result of a cost study based on the FCC methodology will be higher than that of the GTE

study because a greater amount of common costs are assigned in the costing process, rather than in the pricing process. Yet inexplicably, the FCC's proxy price ceilings are set substantially lower than either the purely incremental costs produced by GTE's methodology (that do not include common costs), or those incremental costs adopted by the FPSC that allowed a very small allocation of common costs.

6. The three purposes of this supplemental affidavit are: (i) to discuss the serious flaws in the FCC's loop proxy price development process; (ii) to compare the results of cost studies prepared using the FCC's prescribed methodology that GTE has completed during the period following the filing of the *GTE/SNET FCC Motion* with the FCC's mandatory proxy price ceilings; and (iii) to compare the revenues that would be obtained using the FCC's proxy prices from an average residence or business service in GTE's California service area to both the revenues generated from elements priced at TELRIC and to current average per line revenues. As the attached Exhibits 1 and 2 demonstrate, when GTE adheres to the FCC's prescribed costing methodology, the costs that result are much higher than the mandatory proxy ceiling prices. Specifically, GTE's loop costs average at least 50 percent larger than the FCC's ceiling price. As described following, this result is not startling because the FCC based its statewide average loop proxy price calculations on inputs that do not represent actual statewide average loop costs. GTE's unbundled end office switching costs average at least two-and-a-half times the FCC's price ceiling of $0.004 per minute, even when all possible switching features and functions are not included. Moreover, as Exhibit 3 shows, when GTE compares the revenues that would be

obtained from the FCC's proxy prices to either the revenues from elements priced at the TELRICs computed by GTE or to current revenues per line, it is clear that a large gap exists. It is also obvious that the effective discount from the equivalent retail service price using the FCC proxy prices is much larger than the discount ceiling established by the FCC for resold services.

7. The *First Report and Order* specified (at ¶ 744) that the rate for unbundled local loops be a flat, per-month charge. Further, the FCC specified (at ¶ 794, Appendix D) the statewide average ceiling price that a state regulatory agency could adopt in an arbitration proceeding unless the state commission had completed its review of cost studies that comport to the FCC methodology.

8. The FCC's derivation of loop proxy prices is seriously flawed and cannot in any way be portrayed as representative of GTE's loop costs. The FCC used three sets of 6 numbers (or 18 numbers in total) to calculate the loop proxy price. First, the FCC used the loop prices adopted by 6 state commissions (Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, Oregon). GTE does not operate in two of those states, and the state agency decisions in three of the four other states involved only the regional Bell Operating Company ("BOC"). The FCC's use of prices developed for BOC serving areas is surprising on its face, because the *First Report and Order* (at n.1877) recognized that there "is a strong (negative) correlation between population density and the loop costs." (This simply means that the higher the population density, the lower the cost, and the lower the population density, the higher the cost.) Because BOC serving areas are far more densely populated that GTE's serving areas, this alone seriously understates the

proxy price that would be representative for GTE. Moreover, the involved state commissions did not rely upon cost study methodologies that were anywhere close to the FCC's prescribed methodology.

9. Second, the FCC used the results of two cost models, the Benchmark Cost Model (BCM) and the Hatfield 2.2 model for the same 6 states. This is also surprising because the *First Report and Order* admits (at ¶ 835) that both of these models "were submitted too late in this proceeding for the Commission and parties to evaluate them fully." And, GTE's preliminary evaluations of each model reveals that both systematically produce absurdly low cost estimates. The BCM model does not contain the service drop (the wire from the end of the cable to the customer premises) or other vital loop cost components (*e.g.*, cross-connects, splice pedestal terminals, splicing). GTE has already described the numerous shortcomings of the Hatfield 2.2 model, including the fact that it understates loop costs by at least $8 per loop. (*See First Report and Order* at ¶ 831)

10. Third, the FCC used these 18 numbers in an extremely simplistic calculation methodology. It calculated a proxy price by averaging the results of two calculations for each state and increasing that average by 5 percent. The two calculations were the result of multiplying the BCM and Hatfield 2.2 cost estimates by a so-called "scaling factor." The "scaling factor" was derived by dividing the simple average of the 6 state commission prices by the sum of the average of the BCM and the Hatfield 2.2 estimates for the same 6 states.

Mathematically, this is expressed as:

Proxy Price $_{\text{state i}}$ = ((Proxy Price $_{\text{BCM for state i}}$ + Proxy Price $_{\text{Hatfield 2.2 for state i}}$) divided by 2) times 1.05, where

Proxy Price $_{\text{BCM for state i}}$ = (BCM estimate for state i) times ((average of 6 state prices) divided by (average of 6 state BCM estimates)), and

Proxy Price $_{\text{Hatfield 2.2 for state i}}$ = (Hatfield 2.2 estimate for state i) times ((average of 6 state prices) divided by (average of 6 state Hatfield 2.2 estimates)).

11. Because the state commission prices were not representative of statewide averages, and were in fact based predominately on BOC data, the FCC clearly erred in relying upon those prices to compute statewide average proxy prices. Further, because both the BCM and Hatfield 2.2 models are fundamentally flawed and have not been rigorously review by the FCC or by the parties subjected to the results of calculations based upon those models, the FCC clearly erred in relying upon those cost estimates.

12. GTE's TELRIC cost studies are based upon the methodology prescribed by the *First Report and Order* (at ¶¶ 672-702). GTE first calculated the direct forward-looking cost of each network element. GTE then determined the common costs that could not be attributed to any particular element or sub-group of elements. According to the FCC's methodology, these latter costs are to be allocated to all network elements during the pricing process.

13. Exhibit 1 shows the results of the GTE cost studies for loops in several states where GTE serves a large number of customers. The cost developed using a TELRIC

methodology averages 50 percent larger than the FCC's proxy ceiling price. This difference clearly supports my conclusion in the *Original Trimble Affidavit* (at ¶ 9-14) that the FCC's loop proxy price is arbitrary and inappropriate because it is based upon a mixture of cost estimates for only the bare incremental cost of a loop, rather than being based upon a TELRIC methodology. Further, to assure a proper comparison, neither the proxy price nor the GTE TELRIC results described above include any allocation of common costs as the FCC's own cost methodology requires. Exhibit 2 also shows a comparison of the FCC proxy prices with the output of a new version of the BCM, called BCM II. The BCM II was developed in response to various criticisms of the BCM. Thus, BCM II should be more reflective of forward-looking loop costs than BCM. In the ten GTE serving areas, the BCM II estimates are more than double the proxy prices. This result also supports my conclusion that the FCC's loop proxy prices are woefully low.

14. The *First Report and Order* specified (at ¶ 412) that the unbundled local switching network element is to include not only line-to-line and line-to-trunk "basic switching," but also all of the features, functions, and capabilities, such as a telephone number, directory listing, dial tone, signaling, and access to 911, operator services and directory assistance, all vertical features including custom calling and CLASS features, Centrex, and any technically feasible customized routing functions. The unbundled local switching rate structure is required to include "a combination of a flat-rated charge for line ports, which are dedicated to a single new entrant, and either a flat-rate or per-minute usage charge for the switching matrix and for trunk ports, which constitute shared facilities, best reflects the way costs for unbundled local

switching are incurred." *Id.* at ¶ 810. Unless a state regulatory agency has completed its review of cost studies that comport with the FCC's costing methodology, state agencies are required (*Id.* at ¶ 815) to set the rate for unbundled local switching "so that the sum of the flat-rated charge for line ports and the product of the projected minutes of use per port and the usage-sensitive charges for switching and trunk ports, all divided by the projected minutes of use, does not exceed 0.4 cents ($0.004) per minute of use and is not lower than 0.2 cents ($0.002) per minute of use."

15. Exhibit 2 compares the FCC's proxy price for unbundled local switching to the results of cost studies prepared by GTE using the FCC's TELRIC methodology. Shown are GTE's cost estimates for three end office switching cost elements for a number of states where GTE serves a large number of customers. Those elements are: (i) a per minute cost to switch a call; (ii) a per line per month cost for the non-usage sensitive components of a switch (*e.g.*, line card); and (iii) a per line per month cost for a representative feature package. The cost element of a per line, per month cost for the feature package was chosen to comply with the FCC's mandate that a rate structure recover costs "in a manner that efficiently apportions costs among users." *First Report and Order* at ¶ 755. It is <u>very</u> important to note that the feature package selected for illustrative purposes does <u>not</u> include all of the features, functions and capabilities that a switch may be capable of providing. The package selected includes only many of the most commonly used features (*e.g.*, Call Waiting, Emergency Bureau Access, Speed Calling, Time of Day Routing). Also not included in any of the three cost estimates in Exhibit 2 are the costs associated with a directory listing or the more esoteric switch features such as customized routing

and Meet-Me Conference Bridging. The feature package used in calculating the cost for two states shown in Exhibit 2, Ohio and Wisconsin, did include additional, more advanced features, just to show the potential cost impact on a per minute basis.

16. To provide a logical comparison, GTE converted the two per line, per month cost elements into an equivalent per minute cost by dividing by the average switched minutes of use per month, including minutes associated with both local and long distance calls. The result of this calculation is a composite TELRIC per minute cost that is three-and-a half times the FCC's upper price ceiling of $0.004, even when ignoring the two states with feature packages that include extraordinary features. These results confirm my conclusion in the *Original Trimble Affidavit* (at ¶¶ 17-20) that the FCC's local switching proxy price was based upon information that estimated the incremental cost of line-to-line or line-to-trunk basic switching, but did not, as the FCC's own methodology requires, include either the costs related to other switch features and functions, or common costs.

17. Exhibit 3 compares the FCC's proxy price for a combination of unbundled local switching and an unbundled local loop (*i.e.*, the reassembled equivalent of local service) to both the results of a GTE California ("GTEC") TELRIC study, and to current average revenues per line in California. To prepare this comparison, GTE derived the average monthly usage per line, including local and toll minutes of use, for an average of residence and business lines. This average number of minutes was multiplied by the FCC's proxy price ceiling of $0.004 per minute, and that switched usage revenue amount was added to the flat rate components that would also be needed to comprise reassembled local service (*i.e.*, a local loop and a Network

Interface Device, or "NID"). GTE also derived the current revenues per line for an average of California residence and business lines, including flat rate local charges, local and toll usage charges, and vertical feature charges. When the unbundled network elements of switching, a loop and a NID are combined to replicate local service, the revenues from those elements when priced at the FCC's proxy rates are approximately half of GTEC's TELRIC for the combined service (Exhibit 3, $18.88 compared to $36.35 per month). This comparison of price to cost understates the shortfall, because by definition TELRIC does not include an allocation of common costs. Further, the FCC's proxy prices would provide new entrants with approximately a 60 percent discount off GTEC's current average retail revenue per line in California (Exhibit 3, $18.88 compared to $46.31 per month). Clearly neither the FCC proxy price nor the TELRIC methodology come anywhere close to providing revenues that cover GTE's cost of providing service.

18. Moreover, the 60 percent discount that results from the FCC proxy price cannot be squared with the FCC's interim wholesale rates. Section 51.611 of the FCC's rules requires that resale discounts should be "no more than 25 percent." Thus, the FCC's proposed requirements for its two pricing mechanisms (resale and unbundling) are totally inconsistent. The potential discount is significantly below the Company's costs and would result in GTE subsidizing competitive entry.

19. Based upon my review of the FCC's *First Report and Order* and the results of studies GTE has conducted using the FCC's own costing methodology, I am convinced that the FCC's proxy price ceilings for unbundled loops and local switching are significantly below the

cost of providing those network elements, and in absolute conflict with §§ 51.319(c)(1)(C), 51.503 and 51.505 of the FCC's rules.

The affiant says nothing further.

Dennis B. Trimble

Subscribed and sworn to
before me this 15th day of
September, 1996.

Sharon Longman
Notary Public

SHARON LONGMAN
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES
September 29, 1998

Exhibit 1

Supplemental Affidavit of Dennis B. Trimble

Comparison of Loop Proxy Price Ceilings

with

Costs Developed

Using the FCC's Prescribed Methodology,

and with

Benchmark Cost Model Results